

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,406 08/19/2003		Wen Fei Yu	10541-1850	3454	
29074	7590	02/14/2006		EXAMINER	
VISTEON	o Horri		LEO, LEONARD R		
C/O BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE PO BOX 10395				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	IL 60610			3753	
				DATE MAIL ED: 02/14/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action								
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief								

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/643,406	YU, WEN FEI		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Leonard R. Leo	3753		

- over the control of the control	Exammer	Art Unit	
	Leonard R. Leo	3753	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 25 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance of the compliance of the filed of the compliance of the compliance of the complex that the complex the complex that the co	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
b) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in a date set forth in a date than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further count (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims. 			ne issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		otou otamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	

Art Unit: 3753

Upon entry of the amendment filed on January 25, 2006, the following Office action would be as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al. Regarding claims 9-11, the juncture of Yoshida et al inherently meets the claim limitations.

Claims 1-2 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al (Figure 22). Regarding claims 9-11, the juncture of Kobayashi et al inherently meets the claim limitations.

Claims 1-2 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato et al (Figure 7). Regarding claims 9-11, the juncture of Kato et al inherently meets the claim limitations.

Claims 1-2 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gowan et al (Figures 3-4). Regarding claims 9-11, the juncture of Gowan et al inherently meets the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3753

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taisuke et al, Kobayashi et al, Ryan et al, Kato et al or Gowan et al.

Yoshida et al, Kobayashi et al, Ryan et al, Kato et al or Gowan et al discloses all the claimed limitations except specific dimensions.

To employ a specific dimension is considered to be an obvious design expedient, producing no new and/or unexpected results and solving no stated problem. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ any structural dimension to achieve a desired

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard R. Leo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4916. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on (571) 272-4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leonard R. Leo Primary Examiner Art Unit 3753 Page 4

February 7, 2006